

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claim 17 has been amended to include therein elements of claim 27. In addition, claim 17 clearly recites the at least two rear axle units which are illustrated in Figure 2. Further, while the forward one of the rear axle units is adapted to be connected to the chassis element, each rear axle unit is a substantially self-supporting axle module enabling the rear axle units to be connected to each other by the respective frames of the rear axle units being connected to each other. It is submitted that this complete arrangement of amended claim 17 is neither shown nor suggested in the prior art.

Claims 17-25 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Cassese. Reconsideration is requested. Claim 17 has been amended by inclusion therein of elements of claim 27 and as discussed above. This adds elements not shown or suggested in Cassese. The rejection of these claims has been rendered moot by the amendment thereof.

Claims 31, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Cassese in view of the Examiner's taking Official Notice of tow bars and coupling devices. Reconsideration is requested for the same reasons as above, namely the amendment of parent claim 17.

Claims 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Cassese in view of Schmitz' showing of features of an individual suspension with lower and upper link arms, etc. Reconsideration is requested. Claim 26 is believed to be allowable as a dependent claim.

Claim 27 has been canceled, but its elements are now in amended claim 17. It is submitted that Cassese and Schmitz together do not suggest amended claim 17 or the features thereof discussed thoroughly above. Neither of the references shows at least two individual rear axle units each having a respective frame and an axle on the frame, such that the forward frame may be attached to the vehicle chassis element while the other frame(s) may be attached to each other. Since neither reference shows separate but attached together frames, neither reference suggests Applicant's arrangement with a plurality of frames connected as claimed.

The Examiner says that Schmitz' teaching of a vehicle with multiple rear wheels suggests Applicant's at least two separate frames of amended claim 17. Reconsideration on this is requested. Schmitz may teach additional rear wheels, but, as one infers from the Examiner's remarks, Schmitz does not show or suggest an additional frame for supporting each additional set

of wheels nor does Schmitz show or suggest separate rear axle units connected to each other by their respective frames, in that Schmitz does not show separate frames. To impute to Schmitz the existence of at least two frames and attachment of frames, when no such additional frames and therefore no attachment of frames is suggested, is to by hindsight amend Schmitz' disclosure to disclose something that is neither shown nor suggested in Schmitz. Cassese does not show or suggest at least two frames.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 17 is distinguishable from Cassese in view of Schmitz which neither show nor suggest claim 17.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all of claims 17-26 and 28-33 is requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 16, 2004:

Robert C. Faber

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

  
Signature

January 16, 2004

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:mjb/lac